United Nations S/PV.6472 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Sixty-sixth year

Provisional

6472nd meeting

Friday, 21 January 2011, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Čolaković/Mr. Jerkić	(Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Members:	Brazil	Mr. Pontes
	China	Mr. Huang Hongjiang
	Colombia	Mr. Calderón-Velásquez
	France	Mr. Marchetti
	Gabon	Mr. Ngyema Ndong
	Germany	Mr. Eick
	India	Mr. Gupta
	Lebanon	Ms. Tawk
	Nigeria	Mr. Edokpa
	Portugal	Mr. Vaz Patto
	Russian Federation	Ms. Eloeva
	South Africa	Ms. Rulumeni
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harvey
	United States of America	Mr. Banks

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Institution-building

Letter dated 10 January 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2011/16)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

11-21335 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting resumed at 3.10 p.m.

The President: I again wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than four minutes, in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. I would also like to remind delegations with longer statements that they may circulate them in writing.

I now give the floor to the representative of Costa Rica.

Mr. Ulibarri (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to begin by thanking the delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina for its initiative in convening this open debate. I would also like to thank Deputy Prime Minister José Luis Guterres of Timor-Leste, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and Ambassador Peter Wittig for their opening briefings.

Costa Rica has decided to participate in this important debate because we believe that we can contribute some pertinent ideas and experiences on institution-building as a way to consolidate peace and improve the well-being of people in the aftermath of conflict. To recall the historical background, in 1948 our country went through a brief civil war brought on by elections disputes. What made this case different from so many others was that the victorious Government junta soon handed over power to the legitimately elected authorities, abolished the army and convened an assembly that issued the Constitution that still governs us today. Those institutional decisions, along with longstanding political, economic and social values and dynamics, explain our continued stability and internal peace in a region that has so often been affected by conflict.

During the 1980s, when wars were bloodying Central America, our country played a key role in setting a course towards peace. On 7 August 1987, the Presidents of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua signed the accord known as Esquipulas II, in which they committed themselves to initiating national dialogue processes aimed at ending internal hostilities, holding free and fair elections and forging a peaceful and democratic future.

The success of this process was primarily the result of the willingness of local actors, who were exhausted by violence and aware that the imminent end to the Cold War would cease to fuel hostilities. However, the active participation of the international community and the existence of regional leadership to guide those efforts also played an essential role. That leadership was embodied by Presidents Vinicio Cerezo Arévalo of Guatemala and Óscar Arias Sánchez of Costa Rica, who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts. For their part, the Organization of American States and the United Nations were able to coordinate efforts to promote national and regional willingness to support the process and ensure the implementation of agreements.

Various lessons can be learned from this situation, as reflected in the elements to which I have just referred. What was key to consolidating peace, however, was understanding that a cessation of hostilities would be to little avail if the regional agreement and the national accords that ensued in Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala did not address the root causes of the conflicts. That understanding was also the reason for the decision to set up local political, institutional and socio-economic follow-up mechanisms, along with valuable international support.

Central America's evolution since that time also led us to understand that if challenges are not addressed in time they can weaken peace processes, place democracy at risk and even damage relations between neighbouring nations. Our region buried its internal wars, promoted democratic processes and opened up uncertain paths towards improving people's well-being. However, this did not necessarily bring with it a vigorously inclusive development process, an end to violence — now criminal in nature — or the widespread consolidation of democratic institutions and practices. Today some Central American countries are among the world's most violent. Moreover, one country recently violated the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity. To varying degrees, all of this endangers peace and coexistence at both the local and regional levels.

But from those missteps come important lessons about post-conflict institution-building, to which I should now like to turn.

First, we should design policies that, in addition to promoting post-conflict stability and economic development, also contribute to the widest possible enjoyment of their benefits. Social inclusion is key to peace.

Secondly, in countries with a large percentage of young people such as ours, it is crucial to increase

opportunities for youth in the areas of education, recreation and employment. Without that, both the temptations posed by gangs and organized crime and the continuing cycle of poverty may prove to be unavoidable.

Thirdly, the establishment of institutions, including political parties, must be accompanied by good political practices. Without observing such practices, institutions can become victims of corruption and manipulation, or become simply window dressing for authoritarianism, arbitrary rule and adventurism.

Fourthly, the effectiveness and independence of judicial authorities is another key factor to lasting peace, given that the judiciary is the ultimate resort for the peaceful resolution of conflicts and the most obvious barrier to impunity and crime.

Fifthly, we must keep in mind that it is more difficult to entrench a genuine culture of democracy and peace than to establish institutions. Peace and democracy education is therefore essential.

Finally, fostering an independent and vigorous civil society, a free and honest press and a culture of accountability also substantially increases prospects for peacebuilding.

To sum up, we believe that actions should lead to comprehensive approaches to conflicts, both in order to resolve them and to consolidate the progress made. The role of the United Nations, and of the Security Council in particular, is key to that end; as is the guidance provided by the Peacebuilding Commission. An essential part of the mission of the United Nations must be working as part of the ongoing processes of conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, including the promotion of development, institutions and a culture of peace and democracy.

That necessarily implies a joint effort by all organs and agencies of the United Nations at every stage of those processes, as well as the determination not to act only when weapons are fired but when threats appear. That is something that must of course start with a serious political commitment.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Uganda.

Mr. Lukwiya (Uganda): I thank the presidency of the Council for organizing this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. I also thank the Secretary-General, the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, and the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission for their insightful statements this morning.

Uganda welcomes the increasing emphasis on the need to ensure that post-conflict peacebuilding activities are carried out in a more coordinated, coherent and effective way. Post-conflict countries face a number of challenges, including insecurity, weak or non-existent State institutions, the resettlement of internally displaced persons and refugees, reconstruction and economic recovery, which are often compounded by lack of resources. It is therefore essential that peacebuilding efforts be underpinned by recognition of the need to address the root causes of conflict and to build effective national institutions for sustainable peace and development.

In this regard, the primary responsibility for re-establishing and building the institutions of governance lies with national authorities, supported by international partners, including regional organizations and the United Nations. In Uganda's experience, the building of national institutions requires identifying key priorities based on a country's specific needs. This should be followed by developing and agreeing on a national strategy to address them, and by mobilizing the requisite political, financial and technical support and resources. Given the competing demands on scarce resources, it is important to sequence implementation beginning with the most urgent priorities. These include guaranteeing security of life and property, national reconciliation, adherence to the rule of law, and promoting democratic governance. It is also important to develop and implement a national economic recovery programme.

In order to build effective national institutions in post-conflict situations, these must enjoy popular support and legitimacy to overcome the distrust and suspicion that follow conflict. One way to achieve public trust and legitimacy is by ensuring that institutions are responsive to the needs of the populations and that decision-making is consultative and participatory. There is also a need to focus on delivering tangible dividends, including the provision of basic services and the improvement of the standard of living of the population. In cases where gross violations of human rights have been committed, justice must be done so that those responsible are held accountable.

The major challenge post-conflict countries face in building national institutions is mainly the lack of financial resources and technical expertise in various fields. We welcome the increasing engagement of the United Nations, through the Peacebuilding Commission, regional and international partners, and international financial institutions in support of national capacity development and improving mobilization of resources for peacebuilding. The best and most sustainable approach is to build on existing national human resources and capacities. Where technical expertise and assistance are provided, emphasis should also be placed on building national capacities to undertake those responsibilities.

Finally, we look forward to the imminent completion of the Senior Advisory Group's review of international civilian capacities and its recommendations for improving the international response by strengthening the availability and appropriateness of civilian capacities for post-conflict peacebuilding. Of particular interest will be proposals on how best to mobilize and organize specific civilian capacities from the global South and among women, and on how to ensure that their deployment enhances the building of national capacities. Uganda reiterates the importance of women's full participation in post-conflict peacebuilding and involvement in institution-building.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

Mr. Bouchaara (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation congratulates you, Madame, on your country's leadership and proactive work since assuming the presidency this month. There is no doubt that today's debate will complement those we have already held on the important issue of peacebuilding and the ways and means of guaranteeing the building or rebuilding of State institutions in order to maintain peace in the post-conflict context.

While we associate ourselves with the statement made by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, my delegation should like to focus on the following points.

Since 1992, the total number of armed conflicts has been reduced by 40 per cent. According to the World Bank, the financial costs of ongoing conflicts throughout the world, and in particular in Africa, are estimated at some $54 billion. These figures underscore the magnitude of the work that remains to be done and the critical value of strengthening the institutional capacities of States in the post-conflict context. The emergence of lasting peace often involves the management of the critical phase of transition between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. In that transition phase, rebuilding and strengthening the institutional capacities of States emerging from conflict is of particular importance, given the numerous dangers of backsliding.

In that respect, coordination between local and international stakeholders is critical to stabilizing the host country. It has been noted, however, that one of the main challenges to peacebuilding is ensuring the consistency and coordination of the work of international actors. Too often, the United Nations and its international partners act without sufficiently involving the authorities of the host country. A space must be created in which the host country can take ownership of the project in order to lay the foundations of lasting peace.

These observations encourage us to focus our collective thinking on the best way to take the existing institutional capacities of the host country into consideration and to strengthen them. We must not misidentify our objectives. Peacebuilding missions must support and not compete with national institutional capacities. Thus, a United Nations post-conflict presence must ensure that national strategies are formulated with the host country with a focus on priorities that include the strengthening of the institutional capacities of the host, the restoration of the rule of law, and reform of the security and judicial sectors.

In the framework of such a vast undertaking, it is critical that United Nations efforts be effectively coordinated in order consistently to address the establishment of peace, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development so that swift and effective action can be taken immediately after a conflict. The Peacebuilding Commission plays a key role in that respect.

During the transition between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, the United Nations has a key role to play in assisting national authorities from the very outset in drafting a strategy to establish and strengthen State institutional capacities. It goes without saying that international partners must align their financial, technical and political support with that strategy. The

Kingdom of Morocco stresses the importance for national authorities to take ownership of peacebuilding and to shoulder as soon as possible the responsibility for rebuilding State institutions, restoring the rule of law, revitalizing the economy and reforming the security sector and the judiciary so as to ensure that basic services are provided to meet the basic needs of the people.

In that regard, an integrated approach to peacebuilding must be developed by creating synergies and necessary coordination between national and international structures. Numerous lessons can be drawn from the work of the various country configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission, in particular those linked to the implementation of institutional capacity-building programmes. It should be underscored that the establishment or re-establishment of State institutions goes hand-in-hand with economic revitalization. Socio-economic activities have a quick impact and help to strengthen State institutional capacities in the post-conflict period. Emphasis should therefore be placed on such catalytic areas as youth employment, infrastructure development and the provision of such basic services in the areas of sanitation, drinking water and health.

We cannot emphasize enough that the peacebuilding phase is crucial to stabilizing a country. Statistics indicate that 40 to 50 per cent of all conflicts are the result of relapse. That points to the great importance of peacebuilding, which is above all a collective undertaking. The challenges it presents cannot be overcome without the active involvement of the international community in strengthening State institutional capacity. That illustrates the crucial need for arriving at a partnership approach to peacebuilding between the host country, the United Nations and donors. In that regard, we welcome the increased coordination and coherence between the Peacebuilding Support Office and the World Bank in the area of peacebuilding, whose goal must of course be to establish that same spirit of partnership.

Given that peacebuilding is above all more of a civilian than a military endeavour, it is essential to ensure necessary civilian capacities in critical areas of host country institutional recovery, especially in the areas of training, public administration and judicial and good-governance capacity-building.

In conclusion, peacebuilding cannot be effective without establishing robust institutional capacities based on the rule of law and good governance. The best way to ensure that a State can move towards peace is to develop its institutional architecture by consolidating the rule of law and guaranteeing more effective and inclusive public administration on behalf of the population concerned.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Japan.

Mr. Nishida (Japan): At the outset, Japan extends its congratulations to Bosnia and Herzegovina on its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Japan convened an open debate on peacebuilding at the Council last April (see S/PV.6299). We are thus heartened by the holding of this meeting, which serves to highlight the success of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a country that has experienced the post-conflict peacebuilding process, as well as to provide encouragement for others currently undergoing that process. We also appreciate the briefings by the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. José Luis Guterres of Timor-Leste and Ambassador Wittig of Germany, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

Japan attaches a great importance to institution-building. Based on our own experience in reconstruction, valuing national ownership is the primary principle of our development assistance. In that context, discussion on the role of the Security Council in promoting institution-building is relevant. I would like to offer three points from Japan's perspective.

First, the Security Council should utilize the PBC more proactively. I shall return to this issue later.

Secondly, there is a global shortage of civilian capacity for institution-building. There is therefore an urgent need for fostering such capacity. In order to facilitate the training for and the expeditious deployment of such capability, we believe that the Security Council must review and implement the conclusions of the upcoming report by Mr. Guéhenno in a timely manner.

Thirdly, as the mechanism for partnership in peacebuilding is complex and involves various stakeholders, the Security Council must promote strong leadership on the ground to enable United Nations

representatives and the Government concerned to work together towards solutions, taking into account the specificity of the situation. We also hope that the Secretary-General will appoint strong special representatives, giving particular consideration to women candidates. We hope that Member States will cooperate in submitting appropriate nominees.

Concerning the PBC, the Security Council should tap further into its potential. We believe that will contribute significantly to the Council's decision-making process.

First, the PBC has been holding consultations on some countries on the agenda more frequently than the Security Council itself, including with the participation of the countries concerned and international organizations. Building a stronger link between the deliberations at the two bodies will contribute to providing solutions to various peacebuilding issues. Last year, Japan facilitated the holding of an informal dialogue of the Council with the PBC. The Security Council should consider holding such informal dialogues on a more regular basis, which will also contribute to better relationships with host countries.

Secondly, the PBC can be used as a forum for discussing exit strategies for peacekeeping missions. Liberia could serve as a test case in that regard when determining whether we can arrive at a successful exit for peacekeeping mission in order to handover to peacebuilding partners. We also heard from the representative of Timor-Leste today that his country needs a smooth transition from peacekeeping to assistance from development partners. In that context, it is worthwhile to consider placing a country on the agenda of the PBC in order to provide more effective international support in the transition phase. The PBC could increase the number of countries on its agenda and seek to determine the best strategies to assist post-conflict countries based on lessons learned.

Thirdly, the PBC is also a valuable forum for raising international awareness and mobilizing resources. With that in mind, Japan intends to add approximately $13 million to the Peacebuilding Fund. We hope to utilize the Fund to more effectively fill the gap between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. We urge other countries to contribute to the Fund as well.

In conclusion, let me reiterate Japan's appreciation for the holding of today's meeting focused on institution-building, which is a fundamental element of the peacebuilding process. Japan will continue to contribute actively in this field, including through exploring the expanded utility of the PBC.

The President: I now give the floor to Mr. Peter Shwaiger, Deputy Head of the delegation of the European Union to the United Nations.

Mr. Shwaiger: Let me start by thanking Bosnia and Herzegovina for organizing this debate on institution-building in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding. Your country, Madam President, has first-hand experience of the importance of a topic such as this and how deserving it is of the Council's attention. I also want to thank the Secretary-General, the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste and Mr. Peter Wittig, in his capacity as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for their statements this morning.

The following countries align themselves with this declaration: the candidate countries Turkey, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Montenegro; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Armenia.

"Nothing is possible without men, but nothing is lasting without institutions". That is a quote from Jean Monnet, the chief architect of European unity. The late Richard Holbrooke, the chief architect of Bosnia and Herzegovina's Peace Accord, once invoked those words when arguing that one cannot build peace without building institutions. As the concept paper (S/2011/16, annex) for today's debate underscores, national authorities are in the lead here, but the international community has an important supporting role to play. From our side, for the sake of brevity, let me highlight just three elements that we think are particularly relevant today: coordination, civilian deployment capacities and civil society involvement.

First is better coordination of the different international actors on the ground, including international financial institutions and bilateral donors. The Secretary-General's 2009 report on peacebuilding (S/2009/304) stated that it was incumbent upon the United Nations to spearhead such coordination, especially in the earliest phase. It also stated that that

calls for stronger, more effective and better supported United Nations leadership teams on the ground. However, as the Secretary-General also acknowledged, those United Nations leadership teams, as well as the wider international community, need more clarity from New York on the roles and responsibilities of the various United Nations entities for the critical peacebuilding sectors. We hope to see further advances towards a more rational division of labour, including through incentives to cooperate and harmonize, and we encourage the Secretariat, funds and programmes to press on with the reforms.

Also, the potential of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) should be further unlocked through a strengthened link with the field so that United Nations leadership teams on the ground can profit more from its strategic guidance and political clout, including when it comes to institution-building. Furthermore, I would like to reiterate here the Secretary-General's remark that the Security Council could profit more from the PBC's recommendations in the Council's own early consideration of post-conflict situations, especially when there is a peacekeeping mission on the ground. That would help to tie a mission's activities into the wider coordinated peacebuilding and institution-building effort in a particular country. Let us not forget that successful institution-building, particularly in the security and justice sectors, helps pave the way towards the sustainable exit of any peacekeeping mission.

The second element that I want to mention is civilian deployment capacities. The European Union attaches great importance to the review currently under way in that area. A key task of the review's Senior Advisory Group is to develop proposals to ensure that the deployment of civilian experts in post-conflict countries serves the goal of building national capacity. We look forward to receiving the results of that civilian capacities review soon, and hope that they will be in the form of concrete and realistic objectives and recommendations, to be given appropriate follow-up.

The goal is a more demand-driven, dynamic and flexible civilian deployment that builds on existing national capacities and exhibits a strong South-South character. We hope that the review will chart a path to, for example, the increased global availability of civilian experts for post-conflict situations and the seamless interoperability of civilian capacities within the United Nations system and between the United Nations and other key players, such as regional organizations.

Another important point for us is the enhanced deployment of female civilian experts, in the spirit of resolution 1325 (2000) and the Secretary-General's action plan on ensuring women's participation in peacebuilding. Post-conflict institutions cannot be effective unless they are gender-equitable.

The third and last element that I will mention is civil society involvement. Bolstering civilian oversight mechanisms and local civil society organizations and giving those organizations a seat at the peacebuilding table from day one will enhance the legitimacy and demand-driven nature of both the priorities and the institutions devised there. That is what guides much of the European Union's institution-building assistance around the world.

For example, in Timor-Leste, in the framework of cooperation with Portuguese-speaking countries, the European Union, at the request of the Government and together with the United Nations Development Programme, is working hard to strengthen the capacity of Parliament and the media. Among other things, we will provide media training to parliamentarians and organize seminars for journalists on the role and the functions of parliament in the democratic process.

Furthermore, the European Union has recently funded extensive research on participatory approaches to justice and security sector reform in a number of conflict-affected countries. We are happy to share the results of that exercise with interested partners. Finally, European Union security sector reform programmes, developed jointly with Governments in places such as the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, revolve around increased civilian and parliamentary oversight and accountability to citizens.

It is important to draw strategic lessons, as we are doing today, and to make them available in field manuals. At the same time, we are aware that one-size-fits-all solutions do not exist and that institution-building efforts will always have to be tailored to the specific post-conflict conditions on the ground. As the concept paper points out, national actors know those conditions best, and that is one reason that they should be in the lead. At the end of the day, successful institutional development cannot be transplanted from elsewhere, but is home grown. That is why we are

always happy to hear from the countries themselves, for example through today's statement by Deputy Prime Minister José Luís Guterres, whose country now chairs the Group of Seven Plus and co-chairs the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding.

Supporting home-grown institutional development has long been at the heart of much European Union assistance, be it in the Balkans, the Middle East, Africa, Afghanistan or Haiti. We would like to reaffirm our commitment to pursuing that cause and to working with national authorities, the United Nations, other international actors, civil society organizations and the people in post-conflict countries themselves.

The President: Before I give the floor to the next speaker, I wish once again to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than four minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Kim Bonghyun (Republic of Korea): I will surely limit my statement to four minutes.

At the outset, I would like express my appreciation to you, Madame President, for organizing this meaningful open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding and institution- building.

The scourge of armed conflict causes massive loss of life and unquantifiable societal loss. At the same time, it also severely destroys the key institutions of the nation and, eventually, the Government cannot function properly in support of the daily life of the people. Sixty years ago, the Republic of Korea suffered a devastating and sustained conflict. Therefore, we recognize that fact all too well.

After the cessation of conflict, the building of institutions should commence at the earliest possible juncture. Indeed, post-conflict institution-building should be part of a holistic peacebuilding approach. Working side by side with humanitarian relief and long-term development assistance are important features. The window of opportunity in post-conflict situations is short-lived. Therefore, it must be seized upon to prevent a relapse into violence, which happens mostly within the first decade following a conflict.

To harness the synergy and increase the possibility of success on the ground, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and sustainable development should be pursued in parallel. In addition, both entry and exit strategies need to be planned from the initial stages, as well.

Peacebuilding operations should be executed in a way to further strengthen and respect national ownership and the priorities of the recipient countries. The ultimate goal of peacebuilding is to stabilize the post-conflict situation and to establish a basis for long-term sustainable development. Institution-building is inherent in that formula for success. To that end, international organizations, financial institutions and civil society also have an integral role to play.

In that regard, partnership among all stakeholders should be strengthened, with the Peacebuilding Commission playing the role of facilitator. Within the United Nations system, relations among the Commission, the Security Council and the General Assembly need to be further defined in a more strategic and coordinated manner. Outside the United Nations system, we need to make further efforts to establish constructive relations with the Bretton Woods institutions, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, as well as regional and non-governmental organizations. Considering the increasing role of the private sector in the peacebuilding arena, we also need to continuously engage civil society and other players in the private sector.

Institution-building must ensure that the basic capacity of a nation is restored at the earliest possible time in order to stabilize the fragile post-conflict situation. The rule of law, effective governance and security-sector reform are the areas that require the highest priority. Our efforts in any new peacebuilding area of responsibility need to be focused on restoring those basic functions of a country for both short-term and longer-term sustainable success.

Once again, closer linkage and coordination between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission is crucial in carrying out peacebuilding mandates and helping countries to meet multifaceted post-conflict demands in the field. The challenges identified during the first few years of the Commission's operation only reinforce the importance and critical value of this linkage. Consolidating and

bolstering this relationship will help rebuild lasting institutions in post-conflict areas.

An essential goal of peacebuilding is to present a blueprint of political and socio-economic development for the recipient country, with due consideration to both its potentials and limits. In this process, the building of sustainable institutions is the fundamental groundwork for a country to effectively recover from conflict. In conjunction with effective institution-building, we believe that particular emphasis should be placed in the areas of vocational training and education for youth in order to ensure a more prosperous future for all.

In bringing my remarks to a close, I would like to highlight that just half century ago, the Republic of Korea was a country striving to recover from a devastating war. With the timely and efficient assistance of the international community and the United Nations, we were able to attain stability and development in a relatively short period. From our own experience, we understand and value the importance of institution-building activities.

Against that backdrop, Korea has been contributing to the Peacebuilding Fund on a regular basis and has been a member of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission during the past few years. We hope that Korea's peacebuilding activities within the United Nations will offer a valuable opportunity for us to utilize our past experiences. We want to help facilitate the efforts of post-conflict countries to rebuild and develop their institutions and societies and, in turn, the dreams of future generations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Ms. Cavanagh (New Zealand): I would like to thank the delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina for convening today's open debate. In the interest of time, I will deliver a shortened version of my statement. Hard copies of the full version are being circulated.

Experience has shown that laying the foundations for effective Government institutions is fundamental to securing durable peace. However, despite the global community's best efforts, it is easier to point to examples of qualified failure than to any of unqualified success. Put simply, institution-building is inherently difficult. No clear blueprint exists for doing it effectively. Considerable work remains to be done to develop our understanding of best practices and the practical tools to do the job.

New Zealand has been an active participant in peacebuilding efforts in our region and beyond, including as a significant contributor to United Nations and United Nations-mandated operations in Timor-Leste, Bougainville, Afghanistan and Solomon Islands. I would like to share the following lessons we have drawn from our past involvement in institution-building in post-conflict societies.

First, missions with an institution-building component must make national capacity-building a core consideration in their planning and operations from day one. That requires a careful assessment of existing domestic capacities and priority capacity-building needs from the earliest stage of mandate formation. It is crucial that those assessments also include how the benefits of institution-building can be spread beyond capital cities to regions and local communities. It is important that consideration be given to how a mission's activities can best foster national capacities and, conversely, how to avoid displacing such capacities or stifling their emergence. Effective institution-building also requires a clear definition of the specific objectives being pursued and of how assistance will transition to traditional development partners once those have been achieved. At the same time, it is important to balance that clarity in direction and goals with sufficient flexibility to enable mission leadership to adapt to changes on the ground.

Secondly, institution-building must be pursued in accordance with nationally agreed priorities and objectives. That is crucial to ensuring national ownership, effective coordination and a greater chance that capacities built will be sustained over the long term. An inclusive approach to priority-setting is required. Local communities and civil society play a crucial role in holding together conflict-affected societies.

Thirdly, institution-building assistance must be grounded in a clear-eyed assessment of what capacities are appropriate and sustainable over the long term. Missions must ensure that the institutions they help develop are capable of surviving their departure without placing excessive strain on host Governments. To do otherwise is to risk generating expectations that

cannot be fulfilled or to set States up for long-term dependence on external assistance.

Fourthly, coordination of institution-building assistance is crucial to ensuring its coherence and effectiveness. Important strides have been made within the United Nations system on delivering as one. But that remains a work in progress. It is particularly important that clarity be established early on among actors and leadership teams on the ground regarding respective roles and responsibilities. Better coordination is also required with other actors, notably international financial institutions, bilateral donors and civil society. In particular, we welcome ongoing efforts by the Secretary-General to enhance United Nations-World Bank coordination on post-conflict institution-building. Significant scope still remains to make such coordination work more systematic and effective.

Fifthly, there must be a clear recognition of which institution-building tasks Council-mandated missions should lead on and which tasks other actors are better equipped for. United Nations missions have a crucial role in carrying out immediate stabilization tasks, in supporting the early development of core State institutions essential for maintaining stability and security, in the early articulation of institution-building priorities and in facilitating the delivery of assistance by others. However, many institution-building challenges remain better suited to agencies and donors with a longer-term focus and with a greater accumulation of relevant skills and experience.

Finally, there is an urgent need to enhance the United Nations ability to identify and deploy relevant civilian expertise in a timely manner. Effective institution-building requires a complex and diverse mix of skills. Recent experience has made it clear that existing mechanisms for generating such expertise are inadequate. Too often the expertise provided is determined by available supply, rather than identified need. Too often the process of identifying and deploying experts drags on for a year or more. And too often the ad hoc manner of its supply results in a plethora of actors with differing approaches and advice.

If we are truly serious about the United Nations playing a leading role in post-conflict institution-building, there is an urgent need to significantly strengthen the United Nations ability to rapidly identify and deploy appropriately skilled civilian experts. To achieve that, the Secretariat requires greater flexibility to mobilize and utilize existing expertise within the United Nations system. It needs to explore more flexible arrangements for utilizing the resources offered by Member States. We also need to consider how the United Nations can better draw on external pools of relevant civilian expertise, particularly those from the global South. We hope the upcoming report of the review of international civilian capacities will provide concrete suggestions in these areas.

We have much to learn about how post-conflict institution-building is best carried out and much work to do to provide ourselves with the tools necessary to undertake these tasks successfully. But it is vital that we do learn the lessons, both positive and negative, from our collective experiences to date, if we are to meet the goals we have set ourselves in this area.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mrs. Morgan Sotomayor (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would first like to commend the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina for its initiative in convening this debate. Mexico agrees with the importance that Bosnia and Herzegovina places on the need to include institution-building as a principal element in peacebuilding strategies.

We also recognize the fact that when conflicts are resolved through a peace agreement or ceasefire between the parties, there is a greatly increased risk that those conflicts could break out anew in the post-conflict phase. However, such occasions also provide opportunities to build the basic capacities needed to ensure that peacebuilding efforts take hold. Success is most likely if the political will and readiness to forge consensus on the part of national actors, however minimal, are seized in a timely and rapid way under the favourable political conditions that generally emerge in the phase immediately following the signing of a peace agreement or ceasefire.

When there is no civil authority, the top priority for the population is the reestablishment of a feeling of security. Once progress is made in the area of security, a variety of measures need to be implemented, such as the restoration of Government institutions that are seen as representing the whole population and having sufficient legitimacy to introduce reforms to transform systems and structures from the past that may have contributed to the socio-economic inequality that led to violence.

During our recent membership of the Security Council, Mexico noted that, in general, in countries emerging from protracted conflict, attention is focused on humanitarian assistance and recovery as immediate priorities. In that regard, support for institution-building is left to a later stage, which undermines the capacity of the State to put in place conditions for stability, national reconciliation, respect for human rights and the promotion of long-term development.

My delegation would like to recall that, during one of our terms as President of the Council, we convened a debate on the strengthening of the rule of law in the context of the maintenance of international peace and security. On that occasion, the importance of post-conflict capacity-building was recognized, in particular building civil society capacity as a key element for strengthening the rule of law and laying the foundations of lasting peace.

Mexico believes that one essential task of the Council is to set mandates for peacekeeping operations that strengthen the rule of law within countries in or emerging from conflict. My country therefore appreciates and welcomes the fact that the Security Council is increasingly incorporating this concept into its decisions.

In that context, we reiterate that the immediate priority in post-conflict situations must be supporting the country to restore its institutions, including in the initial phase, with the establishment of internationally supported transition institutions, but also with the decisive involvement of local capacities to ensure national ownership and subsequent self-sustaining development.

In these efforts, as recognized in the report (S/2010/393, annex) of the 2010 review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), co-facilitated by Mexico, the Peacebuilding Commission must play a more relevant role in providing advice and in drafting and implementing peacebuilding strategies. It must also strengthen its coordinating role and its strategic relationships with other United Nations bodies, regional organizations and international financial institutions.

It is important for the PBC to ensure that international assistance is in keeping with national priorities and assists in building institutional capacities in crucial peacebuilding areas. Mexico reiterates the importance of establishing greater international civil capacities in a fast, effective, coherent and coordinated way in countries emerging from conflict. In particular, we should take advantage of the capacities of the southern hemisphere and the potential of women, taking account of their crucial role in peacebuilding processes. In that regard, we hope that the next report of the Secretary-General on post-conflict peacebuilding will include recommendations for strengthening the capacity of the international community and the United Nations to support national institutions.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Nepal.

Mr. Acharya (Nepal): At the outset, let me express my delegation's sincere appreciation to you, Madam President, for having organized this important debate and prepared a comprehensive concept paper (S/2011/16, annex). Nepal has emerged from conflict and is making efforts to consolidate the gains made in the areas of peace, stability and development. We are therefore aware of the importance of deliberations such as these.

Peacebuilding is an important new dimension of our work, which calls for targeted but coherent and coordinated efforts on the political, security, humanitarian and development fronts. These efforts cannot be made in the absence of effective networks for institution-building. In the aftermath of conflict, many State institutions either collapse or become dysfunctional. Even short-term goals such as delivering humanitarian assistance and basic services become extremely difficult, let alone the provision of functional, effective governance, which is the foundation of economic revitalization and sustainable development. It is therefore important to give due priority to the institution-building aspect in planning and setting mandates for United Nations field missions, whether they come under the political, peacekeeping or peacebuilding category.

Here it is also important to stress the critical role of institution-building in the context of a civilian capacity-building review process. We cannot overemphasize the importance of capable State institutions in restoring people's hope for a better future. The credibility and legitimacy of a Government emerging from conflict is critical, and very much depends upon ensuring basic services for people. Institutions are important bridges for restoring trust between the State and citizens. It is critical for there to

be a minimum level of political willingness to take the country from conflict to peace, stability and economic development via concrete programmes.

Institution-building cannot be done in a political vacuum. Gender mainstreaming and the participation of civil society must be factored in during the peacebuilding process. North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation should be fully utilized in building institutions in a post-conflict situation.

National leadership and ownership are key ingredients of sustainable peacebuilding. They can be strengthened only by capacity-building and institution-building. National leadership will take into account local sensitivities and the political context in a coherent manner. We should encourage all national stakeholders to engage in dialogue, identify the best possible solutions to their problems and play a leading role in the implementation process. The country must be engaged in a meaningful way so as to ensure that it remains in the driver's seat, confident in a sustained and durable peacebuilding process.

The international community should lend all the support needed to achieve such a transition. The process following a devastating conflict is a gradual one, but there is no alternative to it. And institution-building plays a very important role in that.

It has already been established that sustained attention, long-term predictable and flexible financing and strong technical cooperation are important for preventing countries from relapsing into conflict. If these conditions can be achieved, it will be possible to consolidate peace and distribute its dividends more widely among the general population.

The Peacebuilding Fund has proven its usefulness in terms of flexible financing. But that is not enough. The World Bank and the other development partners must come up with sufficient financing and technical cooperation to invest in nationally owned development agendas. Institution-building should be an integral part of that. United Nations coordination will ensure the coherence of these efforts.

It is pertinent to recall that one of the aims in creating the Peacebuilding Commission was to focus attention on the institution-building efforts needed to recover from conflict. In that regard, country-specific configurations have a specific responsibility to encourage all stakeholders to work coherently on the basis of an agreed peacebuilding strategy. Some institutions may need to be revived, while others may need to be created. But in doing that, we must ensure that there is strong buy-in to the process among all national stakeholders.

It is evident that a strong sense of partnership among United Nations missions and agencies, Member States, regional organizations, international financial institutions and national stakeholders must be developed. In doing so, restoring and creating necessary State institutions and developing capacities should be made top priorities so as to ensure that peacebuilding functions are carried forward in a sustainable manner. Specific benchmarks and a coordinated strategy are critical. The ultimate goal of international support measures is to create an effective State that can deliver peace and prosperity to its people on its own. That will only be possible by strengthening institutions in the countries themselves.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): I would like to thank Bosnia and Herzegovina for convening today's debate. I also wish to thank the Secretary-General for his statement and Deputy Prime Minister Guterres of Timor-Leste for his insightful comments today. Timor-Leste itself is a nation that has faced immense challenges but has demonstrated strong, effective leadership over its own institution-building process. It is to be congratulated on its commitment to sharing that experience with others and on continuing to call for more effective international support to post-conflict States, including as Chair of the Group of Seven Plus, to which Australia is very pleased to provide support.

I also would like to thank the outgoing Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Wittig, for his contribution to the debate. Australia remains a strong supporter of developing a more organic relationship between the Council and the Commission.

Australia's own experience over the past decade in supporting post-conflict institution-building, particularly in Timor-Leste, the Solomon Islands and Bougainville, Papua New Guinea, has yielded many lessons. Perhaps most important, and one that has been central to the debate today is that national leadership and ownership are fundamental to success. Assistance should support national priorities and objectives, and careful consideration must be given to how assistance

can best foster national capacities and, more importantly, avoid stifling them.

The process of institution-building — and it is a process — must be timely, flexible and sustainable. Planning and implementation need to start as soon as possible in the project, and also progress at a pace and in a manner appropriate to local needs. We must avoid imposing ill-fitting models and ensure that we harness and strengthen existing capacities as we seek to develop them further.

It is important to ensure strong coordination among international actors. We must garner available expertise in a coherent manner. Australia encourages opportunities for South-South and triangular cooperation, and for enhanced cooperation with regional organizations — something we ourselves have tried to do, for example, through our leadership of the Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands.

Assistance obviously should be extended beyond capitals to the subnational level, civil society and the private sector. We need to strengthen the fabric of stable and prosperous communities through political, security, service delivery and economic institutions. We must recognize and promote the role of women, who must be empowered to contribute to decision-making and the implementation of institution-building.

Institution-building in any environment is obviously complex. Institution-building in post-conflict situations clearly presents even greater challenges. That is why it is important that we share ideas and best practices.

The United Nations has a vital role to play in peacebuilding owing to its unique legitimacy and comparative advantages. We encourage the Security Council to consider institution-building when setting mission mandates, but to do so while also giving consideration to the role that other actors should play. It should also continue to mandate integrated United Nations missions to ensure comprehensive approaches. We would also encourage better definition of roles and responsibilities in key peacebuilding sectors within the United Nations system.

My own country has been pleased to contribute to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) over the past year. We believe very clearly that the PBC can play a stronger role in supporting post-conflict institution-building, particularly by monitoring progress, assisting coordination and providing expert guidance to the Council. The Council should increasingly draw on the PBC's advisory role. We endorse the comments made earlier today by Ambassador Grauls of Belgium on behalf of Brazil, Canada, Jordan and Switzerland in their respective capacities as Chairs of the PBC's country-specific configurations.

We also encourage greater coordination between the United Nations and the World Bank and other regional development banks, given their influential role in institution-building.

Obviously, we need to use our resources to greatest effect. In that regard, we look forward to the conclusion of the forthcoming review of international civilian capacities, which we hope will enhance the United Nations effectiveness in supporting post-conflict institution-building, including by increasing its ability to draw on truly relevant expertise in response to defined needs from the global North and the global South.

We stand ready to contribute expertise through the Australian Civilian Corps, which we established in 2009 specifically to provide skilled personnel to support countries experiencing or emerging from conflict or natural disasters.

At times, the challenges of institution-building can obviously seem overwhelming. The international community must be realistic in its expectations, set clear objectives and coordinate and sustain support for institution-building over the long term, regardless of the challenges; otherwise post-conflict success does not happen. This work requires patience, but it is critical, given the centrality of strong national institutions in delivering robust and sustainable peace.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Peru.

Mr. Gutiérrez (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): We wish to thank the Security Council, in particular the delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, for the timely convening of this debate and the drafting of the concept paper (S/2011/16, annex), which helps the Council to give greater thought to key elements of a more effective Peacebuilding Commission and contributes to the organization and planning required to implement the recommendations emanating from the review process.

Peru attaches the greatest importance to adopting comprehensive and multidimensional strategies for peacebuilding in post-conflict situations. Such strategies promote security, development and good governance in close coordination with all United Nations system agencies. The adoption of a needs-driven or a demand-driven approach and the prevention of a resurgence of conflict are crucial pillars in the design of a comprehensive strategy. In that regard, we believe that a needs-driven approach must take account of the specificities of each case and of national priorities, thereby facilitating a targeted response.

In his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, the Secretary-General pointed out priority areas in which peacebuilding work should be conducted simultaneously. One of the key main areas involves the importance of a cross-cutting and holistic security strategy in which priority is given to development and institution-building. The cross-cutting strategy reflects the need to include early peacebuilding efforts during the implementation of peacekeeping processes.

In order to prevent a resurgence of conflict, it is imperative to rebuild and bolster the institutional capacities of the country in question. Institution-building is an indispensable factor of sustainable socio-economic development. A comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, which must include provisions for institution-building, should be based on national ownership and a prior assessment of existing national capacities. In that way, international support and cooperation will fill the gaps where capacity is lacking and strengthen the areas where there are weaknesses. The implementation of the Agenda for Change and the poverty reduction strategy in Sierra Leone could serve as useful examples in evaluating positive aspects and areas for improvement through a lessons-learned approach.

In implementing the strategy, it is imperative to establish mechanisms for inclusion to ensure the maximum involvement of society and the public and private sectors. Such an approach will mend the social and political fabric as a framework for the rule of law and will lay the foundation for the country's reconstruction. In that regard, we should recall that the empowerment of women and the gender perspective are key factors in generating capacity and in the peacebuilding process, as underscored in the Secretary-General's report.

Particular attention must also be paid to job creation and training for young people who are unemployed or underemployed, and who are a high-risk and potentially disruptive factor in the transition to peacebuilding and institution-building. It is also essential to sustain close and ongoing coordination with local stakeholders and partners providing international assistance, with particular emphasis on regional cooperation, South-South cooperation and North-South triangular cooperation. This will ensure the implementation of a needs-driven strategy on the ground and take account of the experience and expertise of the partners.

Peru believes that determining the origin of a conflict and the need for a transition towards peace and for the rebuilding process — and therefore for early peacebuilding efforts and a preventive dimension — are aspects that must be taken into account when the mandate of a peacekeeping operation is first established. These considerations must be part of the groundwork for a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, including in rebuilding and strengthening institutional capacities.

The Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, in particular its Organizational Committee, have a crucial role to play in drafting mandates for peacebuilding operations and in formulating and implementing the aforementioned comprehensive strategy. Mechanisms must therefore be established so that the Peacebuilding Commission, as a subsidiary body of the Council and the General Assembly, can develop active and frequent coordination with both the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Finally, I reiterate the importance my country attaches to the Peacebuilding Commission maintaining its primary advisory and catalytic role within the system, which ensures the consistency, flexibility and effectiveness of the work of the United Nations in peacebuilding processes and in implementing the Secretary-General's action plan.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ukraine.

Mr. Vitrenko (Ukraine): I thank you, Mr. President, for holding this important debate and wish you every success in fulfilling the highly responsible duties of Security Council President.

Our appreciation also goes to Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, His Excellency Mr. José Luís Guterres, for their insights into today's topic. Ukraine's long record of participation in United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts in Timor-Leste and almost 20 other States, including most of the Group of Seven Plus countries, makes this debate quite relevant for my country.

Ukraine aligns itself with the statement of the European Union. As a member of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission, my delegation supports the statement delivered by the Commission's Chair, Mr. Peter Wittig, the Permanent Representative of Germany. I would also like to make a few brief points in my national capacity.

First, we fully agree with the philosophy of the concept paper (S/2011/16, annex) before us that national ownership is an indispensable condition for the establishment of effective core State capacities, leading to the creation of a stable and viable State. My delegation also recognizes that the purpose of institution-building is to reduce the dependence of post-conflict Governments on the international community and to promote self-reliance. Yet the fact that the majority of post-conflict countries relapse into violence within 10 years leaves no doubt about the need for extreme prudence in planning the transition of responsibilities from the international community to national authorities, especially in the security sector.

Secondly, consensus between domestic and international stakeholders on a broad peacebuilding agenda is a sine qua non for the success of the institution-building and peacebuilding endeavour as a whole. If there is a lack of understanding on either side, there will be no chemistry between them and, ultimately, no tangible progress in securing lasting peace.

Thirdly, given the crucial significance of post-conflict institution-building to the success of the overall peacebuilding efforts, my delegation shares the belief in the necessity of integrating the institution-building perspective, tailored to each country and situation, into the mandates of respective United Nations missions from their early stages.

Fourthly, we believe in the transformative power of the relevant regional and subregional organizations in connection with peacebuilding. Nowhere are the benefits of this soft power more evident than in Europe, with the European Union as a case in point. There is a great deal of transformative potential with other European bodies, such as the Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). That is why we see merit in exploring the idea of putting together the best practices and lessons learned of these organizations and sharing them, wherever appropriate, with interested partners in other regions. As a prospective Chair of both the Council of Europe and the OSCE, in May to November 2011 and in 2013, respectively, Ukraine is ready to do its share.

Fifthly, the Peacebuilding Commission is ideally placed to bring together external State and non-State actors with the aim of securing the creation of credible, legitimate, accountable and resilient institutions in countries emerging from conflict. In view of this, the Peacebuilding Commission should play a leading role in enabling the United Nations system to establish an integrated approach to institution-building. If the Commission is to be fully up to this task, greater synergy between the Security Council, General Assembly, Economic and Social Council and Peacebuilding Commission is needed.

Having a long, solid record of contributing to peacebuilding through active military and police engagement in missions under the auspices of the United Nations, Ukraine could be instrumental in assisting the advancement of the institution-building agenda. My country has capacity and is open to considering providing civilian expertise, particularly in the areas of justice, security sector reform and governance, and the training of domestic professionals from fragile States with the aim of further boosting their local civil service capacities.

The concept paper rightly notes the supporting — yet in some cases instrumental — role of humanitarian relief and rehabilitation assistance, especially in the immediate aftermath of conflict or humanitarian disaster. In this respect, Ukraine is proud of its contribution to the Central Emergency Response Fund in response to the United Nations appeal for Haiti.

Today's debate will be taken into account by my delegation in the context of Ukraine's current membership in the Peacebuilding Commission, the Economic and Social Council, UN-Women and other relevant organs. It will also serve as a valuable

reference in the case of Ukraine's election to the Security Council for the term of 2016-2017.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. Rahman (Bangladesh): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) in our capacity as NAM coordinator in the Peacebuilding Commission.

Let me begin by thanking you, Mr. President, for organizing this important debate on the issue of institution-building in the context of peacebuilding in post-conflict countries. We also thank the Secretary-General, the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste and the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission for their respective statements delivered this morning.

This debate is a very timely initiative, as it is taking place as the review of the peacebuilding architecture has just been concluded and the review of international civilian capacity is in its final stage. We believe that this debate will add important value to all relevant processes in further streamlining peacebuilding activities and bringing about sustainable peace in post-conflict countries.

While we recognize that each and every post-conflict situation is unique, our experience is that there are some commonalities across all conflict or post-conflict situations. They negatively impact the regular work of a society by causing damage to physical, psychological and social structures. They shatter institutions, take a toll on human lives, break social bonds and hinder regular activities. The institutional and other capacities previously created in society or embedded in the bond of social dynamics are either broken or remain dormant, and are not readily available to steer the peace process or to make it sustainable.

Therefore, the onus is on us, the international community, to work towards the achievement of sustainable peace by enabling national actors to rebuild their institutions, revitalize their economies and rejuvenate their peaceful lives. This process entails ensuring national ownership in all peacebuilding activities, including institutional capacity-building.

Sustainable peace can be achieved only when the process is shared and owned by those ultimately benefiting from the peace dividends. It is national actors who clearly understand the inherent values and normative priorities of their particular society. Given the diversity in post-conflict situations, the international community, in consultation with the relevant stakeholders, needs to find commonalities among national protagonists to advance their common development agenda. This requires broader political will within the international community and at least a minimal willingness on the part of the different factions in the post-conflict countries.

International support in such dynamic and evolving situations is to be based on broad political willingness and adequate and predictable resources. Efforts skewed towards unduly benefiting one group at the expense of others are likely to exacerbate a situation, igniting the causes of conflict. Active participation by members of civil society and by local and traditional authorities, including marginalized groups, may ease the situation and contribute significantly to ensuring national ownership for achieving peacebuilding goals through a common vision of national development. The full and effective participation of women can further strengthen the process.

We agree with the concept paper (S/2011/16, annex) that building institutional capacity in a post-conflict country is a difficult task. However, it is not impossible. It requires coordinated efforts, constructive willingness, appropriate needs assessment and defining norms and standards. The volatile post-conflict environment is largely defined by a lack of vital resources, including physical infrastructure, human and financial capital and appropriate social bonds. While some of that stems from a lack of adequate confidence, mostly it has to do with insufficient financial resources, technical expertise and institutional skills. No supply-driven approach will suffice. On the other hand, a demand-pull approach coupled with national training and exchange programmes may help. In addition, the provision of adequate and timely resources is indispensable. In that context, the Movement believes that the following points must be kept in mind while planning and conducting post-conflict institution-building activities.

First, any activity relating to peacebuilding in a post-conflict country must be based on the principle of national ownership. In that regard, institution-building activities should also encompass national priorities, taking into account the reality and necessities of the people who are the potential clients of the initiative.

Second, effective partnership must be forged among all Member States so that the varying capacities among them can complement each other and strengthen post-conflict institution-building efforts.

Third, gender mainstreaming and the role of women in post-conflict peacebuilding cannot be overemphasized. The institution-building process and its outcome should ensure gender perspectives as appropriate. While crafting such norms and standards, sufficient attention must be given to ensuring that the concerns of women in the host country are adequately taken into account so as to empower them to effectively participate in the post-conflict country's economic, political, social and security-related activities.

Four, organizational coordination must be addressed. Without prejudice to the functions and powers of the other principal organs of the United Nations, the General Assembly must play the key role in the formulation and implementation of institution-building activities. In this context, the Peacebuilding Commission should play a central role in providing policy guidance and strategies in conducting institution-building activities.

Five, there has to be cooperation among the different United Nations organs. Post-conflict peacebuilding activities should be conducted through intense and effective consultations among the main organs of the United Nations, while duly emphasizing their respective areas of competence.

Six, the role of peacekeepers and early peacebuilding activities need to be properly recognized. In that regard, the significant role of peacekeepers will further strengthen early peacebuilding activities. Furthermore, these activities need to be identified by the United Nations peacebuilding architecture in cooperation with the national Government, including the views of troop-contributing countries in relevant areas.

Seven, with regard to South-South cooperation, countries of the South have similar socio-economic experiences that need to be utilized in the process. In addition, the diverse capacities and skills in the South can be replicated suitably in the form of lessons learned and the development achieved from previous experience in nation-building.

Last but not least, efforts must also include a mechanism for including North-South and triangular cooperation. That would renew the strength of partnerships and complement South-South cooperation.

In conclusion, the Movement believes that the building of institutions in post-conflict countries must be based on a fair appreciation of the circumstances of justice and on the prevailing social situation for which the norms and standards are being postulated. They should reflect a collective thought process premised on the needs and concerns of the people who will ultimately uphold the institutions.

As a supporting partner, the international community must advance its capacities through institutional, technical, financial, human and other assistance in which it has the capacity to do so. The process must forge the effective participation of all stakeholders, including women, civil society and marginalized groups, so as to address the root causes of conflicts.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative to Armenia.

Mr. Nazarian (Armenia): I would like to express our appreciation for the organization of this open debate, as well as to thank you personally, Madame President, for the opportunity to share our views on this important subject.

The frequency with which the Security Council addresses post-conflict peacebuilding signals, first, the importance that the international community attaches to the issue as a preventive tool against the recurrence of conflict through the establishment of sustained security and stability, which are prerequisites for the maintenance of peace and development; and, secondly, an acknowledgement of the Council's responsibility to fulfil the commitments undertaken to support countries that have emerged from conflict.

We share the views expressed by many speakers calling for more systematic attention to post-conflict peacebuilding. We believe that this should continue to be frequently reflected in the deliberations of the Security Council.

Time and again we have seen how conflicts re-emerge in the absence of functioning institutions that reflect a common understanding within a society. Although lessons have been learned and various approaches have been refined as the international

community has tackled such conflicts, the tendency continues to be for a top-down approach that at times ignores the specific context, roots and causes of a given conflict.

Institution-building, especially in post-conflict countries, must be done at all levels of society, with particular attention paid to the uniqueness of each case, in order to reach consensus and create a governing framework. It is important that the programmes adopted be country-specific, needs-based and target-oriented to ensure continued adherence by the affected population. This would safeguard success and assist the population in building upon existing national capacities in a more consolidated and effective manner.

In that context, effective institution-building during the different phases of the process requires coordination among the Peacebuilding Commission and all relevant actors, including international financial institutions, United Nations entities, regional organizations and civil society, including women, local experts and other stakeholders.

With respect to the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council, we believe that, given limited resources, they should work closely together and use each other's knowledge and expertise of a specific country's conflict to clearly identify priorities in order to most effectively use such resources towards peacebuilding efforts. For that cooperation to be workable, both bodies must try to be as flexible as possible to address conflicts in a timely and efficient manner, as each conflict will pose unique problems and require specific solutions.

Armenia remains committed to post-conflict peace initiatives and believes that the Council should further advance development initiatives by supporting peacebuilding mechanisms that help countries emerging from conflicts in their recovery, reintegration and reconstruction efforts, which are aimed at creating foundations for sustainable peace and development.

The successful implementation of this agenda requires a basic level of political will and determination on the part of all players as preconditions for peacebuilding. With those political conditions in place, the ability of the United Nations or any other intergovernmental or regional actor will be enhanced and supported.

Armenia therefore welcomes the Bosnian initiative to hold this open debate. This is an opportunity to recap and reflect on our past experiences in dealing with the issue of post-conflict peacebuilding and to highlight priorities for united, practical actions.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Slovenia.

Ms. Štiglic (Slovenia): First of all, I would like to thank Bosnia and Herzegovina for organizing this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, with a special focus on institution-building, which is a prevalent challenge in a number of societies that have just emerged from conflict. This debate, under Bosnia and Herzegovina's first-ever presidency of the Security Council, has special significance. Bosnia and Herzegovina is a country with extensive first-hand experience of the subject before the Council. In the 15 years since Dayton, Bosnia and Herzegovina has undergone a difficult process of peacebuilding, transition and recovery, and it continues along the path to ensuring further progress in institution-building, integration into Euro-Atlantic structures and overall prosperity.

I would like to thank the Secretary-General for his statement and the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, His Excellency Mr. José Luis Guterres, for sharing his insights into Timor-Leste's experiences in institution-building. My thanks also go to Ambassador Wittig, outgoing Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for his contribution to the Commission's role in promoting and supporting an integrated and coherent approach to peacebuilding, including women's participation.

Slovenia fully aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of the European Union.

I would like to stress the importance of the Secretary-General's 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), as well as to welcome the continuous attention paid to the issue of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

It is widely recognized that in the aftermath of large-scale violence, the needs of the people tend to be far greater than the capacity of national or international actors to meet them. Given that imbalance, national and international efforts in the early post-conflict period should focus primarily on meeting the most

urgent and important peacebuilding objectives, such as establishing security, building confidence and trust in the political process, delivering initial peace dividends and expanding core national capacity.

We believe in the importance of providing support for basic safety and security, including the protection of civilians; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; strengthening the rule of law; demining and supporting security-sector reform. Peacekeepers should be able to contribute in the early stages of peacebuilding, where they are best positioned to do so.

A secure environment is crucial to the implementation of peacebuilding tasks, whether by national or international actors. Societies emerging from war face a high risk of relapse into conflict. It is therefore essential that international efforts facilitate and support their transition from short-term stabilization to long-term security. Capacity development is at the heart of peacebuilding. It is crucial to help create national structures to manage tensions and mediate between various societal interests, with a view to preventing a return to violence. Capacity development is also the main approach to stronger and more resilient State-society relations based on trust and inclusiveness, as it leads to the reactivation of core State functions and helps the State to re-establish legitimate governance throughout the country.

It is imperative that national ownership — which must often be strengthened through a step-by-step process — focus on capacity-building of core Government functions and on national actors. In that context, the international community and regional and subregional organizations should partner with post-conflict societies to assist with institutional capacity-building, promoting the rule of law and strengthening civilian institutions, including ministries, the parliament and the judiciary.

International assistance must be allocated to support State institutions with a view to establishing a basis for competent and legitimate governance. In the process, dependence on international assistance must be gradually but steadfastly reduced, and self-reliance promoted.

Peacebuilding requires coherent, comprehensive and consistent efforts by many different actors working together. It demands the integration of political, security, humanitarian and development considerations. Security and development partnerships must be strengthened to include global, international, regional and local actors as well as civil society.

We recognize the important role of the PBC as an intergovernmental body tasked with developing peacebuilding strategies and providing enhanced coordination for countries that have transitioned from war to peace. We support strengthened institutional arrangements among various United Nations actors, along with closer cooperation between the Security Council and the PBC. In that respect we welcome the statement made by the representative of Belgium on behalf of Brazil, Canada, Jordan and Switzerland in their capacities as Chairs of the PBC's country-specific configurations.

It is crucial that we prevent the persistent violence, intimidation and discrimination against women and encourage their participation and full involvement in post-conflict activities, especially as women can be important drivers of recovery and development in peacebuilding processes. Slovenia welcome the 2010 report of the Secretary-General on women's participation in peacebuilding (S/2010/466), including the seven-point action plan.

The establishment of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality should further contribute to the effective implementation of resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008). Last year, Slovenia adopted its national action plan for the implementation of both resolutions. One of the main objectives of the action plan is to increase the involvement of women in peacebuilding and peacekeeping missions.

While the past 20 years have witnessed a decline in the number of international armed conflicts, there has been an emergence of internal conflicts, mostly in low-income countries, due to horizontal inequalities along ethnic, religious and regional lines associated with civil wars. It is thus clear that numerous peacebuilding challenges still lie ahead and that we must turn to lessons learned and best practices when tackling those challenges in the future. When embarking upon sustainable post-conflict reconstruction, we should ensure and commit to long-term institution-building, as that will ultimately strengthen the processes and conduct necessary to peacefully manage conflicts at all levels.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Serbia.

Mr. Starčević (Serbia): The Republic of Serbia welcomes the format of this open debate in the Security Council on institution-building within the post-conflict peacebuilding process. Charged with responsibility for safeguarding international peace and security, the Council can only benefit from such debate. The delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina should be congratulated for its initiative. The statements by the Secretary-General; Mr. José Luís Guterres, Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste; and Ambassador Peter Wittig, current Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, have given us three important perspectives germane to the issue under discussion, while the statements by members and non-members of the Council alike demonstrate vivid interest in this question.

These are complex problems that call for specific answers — from the elimination of the humanitarian consequences of a conflict to assistance in organizing the election process and the building of new institutions, or the rebuilding of old ones. Yet the need for institution-building is a global problem that affects countries in almost all parts of the world that have experienced a conflict. It therefore calls for global action.

The Republic of Serbia believes that post-conflict institution-building is among the most important efforts in securing peace, stability and sustainable development. For those efforts to be successful, it is necessary that all actors in the international community render a contribution, including the United Nations, regional organizations and Member States that participated in the conflict directly or indirectly or are located in the immediate vicinity, as well as non-governmental organizations.

The United Nations system should be at the forefront of all activities, primarily through its organs — the Security Council and the Secretary-General, the Peacebuilding Commission, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the United Nations Development Programme and the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

Bearing in mind that the Republic of Serbia is part of a region that experienced a very difficult period starting two decades ago, we are well aware of the needs and caveats of a peacebuilding process. We approach it with understanding and responsibly.

We firmly believe that there is a need for all countries of a region that has been engulfed by conflict to engage actively. We have made every effort to make our full contribution to post-conflict peacebuilding through a policy of promoting good-neighbourly relations — one of our most important foreign-policy priorities — through a policy of reconciliation in the region and through building free and democratic institutions.

The Republic of Serbia is a signatory party and a guarantor of the implementation of the Dayton-Paris Peace Agreement. It gives its unwavering support to the territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina and is supportive of all decisions based on the agreement of the three constitutive peoples of that State.

Last year, the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia adopted a resolution condemning the crime at Srebrenica. Serbia cooperates actively with the international presences in Kosovo headed by the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo deployed in the province pursuant to resolution 1244 (1999) and supports activities aimed at improving the living conditions for all inhabitants of Kosovo. We showed our readiness to quickly start a dialogue with Pristina in accordance with resolution 64/298. President Boris Tadić has met the leaders of the other countries of the region on a number of occasions. My country has thus clearly shown its resolve to contribute to peace and stability in the Western Balkan region.

The Republic of Serbia is also of the opinion that full reconciliation in the region will be greatly helped if justice is fully served through national and international institutions with regard to all individuals who committed crimes during the conflict.

Serbia considers institution-building in the post-conflict period to be a process that, because of its complexity, calls for the synergy of internal stakeholders and international actors, a thorough assessment of the causes of conflict and a global approach combined with specific solutions. The role of the United Nations system in this area will always remain vital. We also support the proposal to strengthen the consultative role of the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission.

The Republic of Serbia has been active, and will continue to be so, in support of United Nations activities on building institutions in conflict-affected areas. We shall also continue our support through our

participation in United Nations peacekeeping missions. My country fully concurs with the view that the purpose of institution-building is to progressively reduce dependence on the international community and promote self-reliance. We also agree that there must be at least a basic level of consensus and political will among the leading national stakeholders for institutional development to succeed.

Accordingly, an honest analysis of the events leading to the conflict and of the deeds and mistakes that caused it is necessary to avoid similar pitfalls in the future. New institutions and their procedures must be designed so as to maximize the chances for avoiding a repetition of past mistakes. Those who do not remember history are condemned to repeat it, as Santayana said. Countries that have gone through conflicts need enlightened leaders and enlightened institutions, and people must stand up for them if they care about their future and the future of their children.

Work on promoting sustainable peace, stability and development is the best prevention against the resurgence of conflict. The cost of conflict is so high that it is incumbent upon us to make every possible effort to succeed in our endeavours to build peace.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Andrabi (Pakistan): Madam President, the Pakistan delegation would like to thank you for arranging today's debate and for your insightful concept paper (S/2011/16).

Today's debate coincides with the mandatory review of the Peacebuilding Commission, which concluded late last year, and the review of the international civilian capacities, which is in its final stage. I hope that our deliberations today will complement the work of both these important review processes.

The theme of institution-building can be placed within the broad rubric of priorities identified by the Secretary-General in his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). The Secretary-General's priorities included safety and security, support for political processes, provision of basic services, restoring core government functions and economic revitalization. Similar priorities are also outlined in the President's concept paper.

The international community can optimize its institution-building efforts in conformity with priorities of the countries concerned for ensuring national ownership of all peacebuilding initiatives. To that end, our approach must be people-centric and tailored to specific needs or circumstances. It should not be seen as outside interference. That is important for the longevity and resilience of the nascent institutions built in a post-conflict setting.

I wish to highlight four points in answer to the very pertinent questions raised in the President's concept paper.

First, institution-building should be factored into a mission's mandate from its inception. That can be done by focusing on security sector reform together with strengthening national capacity to manage intercommunity conflicts. Whenever such mandates are devised, peacekeepers have always played an important role, despite resource constraints.

As a leading troop contributor with vital stakes in the success of the peacekeeping operations, Pakistan has been supportive of mandates that ensure local capacity-building to prevent relapse into conflict. That is evident from our record in the Security Council, as resolutions 1509 (2003) and 1565 (2004), which authorized strengthened missions in Liberia and the Democratic Republic of Congo respectively, were supported by Pakistan during its term in the Council. Pakistani troops also participated in those challenging missions.

At present, nearly 10 United Nations peacekeeping missions are performing a broad range of peacebuilding activities, which also include institution-building. Therefore, the role of peacekeepers in post-conflict institution-building cannot be ignored. It will be important to provide for the needs of peacekeepers so that they can better perform their role. In this regard, vital responsibility rests with the Security Council, where these mandates are formalized, and with the Secretariat, where the resources are provided to back them.

Secondly, institution-building in a post-conflict situation can be greatly facilitated by a targeted focus on the development aspect of peacebuilding. Priority areas could include the employment of youth and women, engaging the private sector, building local entrepreneurship, revitalizing the economy and developing service-based infrastructure. Such an

approach will, on the one hand, build national ownership and engage all stakeholders in peacebuilding endeavours and, on the other, will reinforce the notion of the people-centric approach, bringing the benefits of peacebuilding to the common man's doorstep.

Thirdly, organizational coordination within the United Nations is essential to avoid duplication. We note that an Integration Steering Group (ISG), which includes peace and security, humanitarian and development actors across the United Nations, is in place in the Secretariat for policy coordination in 18 countries where there is both a mission and a country team. The ISG can enhance the Secretariat's responsiveness to the institution-building demands.

Finally, the Peacebuilding Commission, with its unique composition, is ideally placed to establish an integrated approach to institution-building and to address the gaps in transition. In this context, I will propose that a working group on institution-building could be created within the Commission's Organizational Committee or within its country-specific configurations. Alternatively, a dedicated theme of institution-building could be added to its existing Working Group on Lessons Learned. That would allow the Commission to optimize its advisory role for all principal organs of the United Nations, not just the Security Council, on the subject of post-conflict institution-building.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania.

Mr. Seruhere (United Republic of Tanzania): Madam President, I thank you for convening this timely debate on post-conflict peacebuilding and institution-building. The United Republic of Tanzania fully supports the concept of and need for institution-building and sees it as an indispensable requirement for preventing post-conflict communities from relapsing into conflict. I have trust and confidence in your leadership qualities, Mr. President, so I have no doubt that you will stir this debate to a fruitful conclusion.

We welcome the statement of the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, His Excellency Ambassador Peter Wittig, Permanent Representative of Germany; that of the Non-Aligned Movement, read by the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen; and the joint statement of the Chairs of the country-specific configurations for Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone, Liberia and Burundi, read by His Excellency Ambassador Jan Grauls, Permanent Representative of Belgium.

Speaking from past and recent experience, the United Republic of Tanzania supported in practical ways the successful processes that ended conflicts in southern Africa and the Great Lakes region. The vision of my country has always been to see the transformation of post-conflict societies into a space of sustainable peace and security of States and peoples, stability as well as shared growth and development. That wisdom is, as a matter of fact, enshrined in the Dar es-Salaam Declaration on Peace, Security, Democracy and Development in the Great Lakes Region, adopted in November 2004.

The former Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, once said that there is no security without development and no development without security. We draw inspiration from the wisdom of both the Dar es-Salaam Declaration and the dictum of Kofi Annan. In order realize that inspiration in the Great Lakes region, where peacebuilding processes are ongoing — and, indeed, elsewhere — institution-building is critical. It is also critical that such institutions lead ultimately to lifting living standards of the people in the post-conflict stages. That way they can also attain the Millennium Development Goals and reach desirable human development indices.

"Peace-building: institution-building" will benefit not only post-conflict societies but also the entire world and the international community. The United Republic of Tanzania says so because, as experienced in the Great Lakes region and elsewhere, local wars suck in other countries from near and far. Thus preventing conflicts and the recurrence of conflicts is beneficial to all humankind.

It is desirable and paramount that all Member States and the international community provide support of every kind to institution-building in post-conflict societies and their neighbours in order to establish, consolidate and promote good governance, democracy, rule of law, respect for human rights, security and stability, as well as economic growth, development and integration. Where that cannot be done by supporting individual States, it should be accomplished through subregional and regional approaches.

The President: I give the floor to the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Observer Mission of the African Union.

Mrs. Mungwa: I would like to begin by presenting the apologies of the Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations, His Excellency Ambassador Téte Antonio, who has travelled to Addis Ababa for the meetings of the upcoming African Union summit and was therefore not able to attend this meeting in person.

We join previous speakers in commending you, Mr. President, for initiating consideration of the well-focused theme of this debate, which is extremely pertinent for Africa. We are grateful to the Secretary-General, the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste, and the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission for attending this meeting in person, and for their pertinent remarks delivered to the Council earlier today. Thank you also, Mr. President, for the concept paper (S/2011/16) that you provided for the guidance of this debate, and also for the presidential statement delivered early in the meeting today.

As a matter of high priority to Africa, post-conflict reconstruction and development as a whole is one of the issues addressed in a range of policy instruments of the African Union, beginning with its Constitutive Act and including the Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union.

In their remarks in the debate this morning, representatives of various African States mentioned the African Policy Framework on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development, which was adopted by the Executive Council during its 7th Ordinary Session, held in Sirte, Libya, in July 2005. We would like to note that this was one of the very first policy instruments adopted by the African Union, just three years after its establishment in 2002, to indicate the importance of the issue at the level of the African Union. This Policy Framework details the concepts, principles, approaches and even the benchmarks that are concerned with the important topic of post-conflict reconstruction and development as a whole. A significant amount of the content is devoted to the question of institution-rebuilding and building.

Previous speakers have mentioned the concept paper. we are very pleased to note that the international community has mentioned a lot of the elements contained in the concept paper and in the African Policy Framework to which I have referred.

I do not think that I can do justice to presenting the Policy Framework. In the interests of time, we would simply highly recommend that policy instrument to members of the Council and all stakeholders.

In adopting the Policy Framework on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development, the Executive Council of the African Union indeed addressed the need to build the institutions of the African Union, which would then drive the task of post-conflict reconstruction and development, including institution-building. This included a ministerial committee on post-conflict reconstruction and development, to be established to provide political support and resource mobilization for implementation of the Policy Framework. It is also envisaged that the ministerial committee will interface with the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission at the highest level.

Various member States of the African Union are also leading key efforts for post-conflict reconstruction and development through the establishment of institutions such as the African Centre for Study and Research on Terrorism, based in Algiers, and through the commendable initiative to establish an institution for post-conflict reconstruction and development announced by the Permanent Representative of Egypt in his intervention in the Council today.

While building necessary continental institutions — which I have just mentioned — to support the task of post-conflict reconstruction and development as a whole, the African Union has also taken a number of concrete steps towards translating the Policy Framework into concrete actions at the level of concerned member States. These have included the establishment of the Post-Conflict Reconstruction Committee on the Sudan, as mentioned by the Permanent Representative of South Africa in his remarks earlier today. We seize this opportunity to commend the outstanding leadership of South Africa on this issue.

The African Union also maintains field offices in a number of member States that are facing the complex situation of having to rebuild after conflict, such as Burundi, Chad, the Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau, the Sudan and Somalia, in order to provide permanent support and to accompany

them with the arduous tasks they face in consolidating peace and rebuilding the institutional, policy and human development fabric that is often devastated by conflict.

As others have today, we take this opportunity to commend the Peacebuilding Commission for its work on the five African countries under its consideration. We would like to take the opportunity to re-pledge and restate the support of the African Union and its intention to continue working closely with the Peacebuilding Commission. Please also allow me to take this opportunity to recall the sentiments expressed to the Security Council late last year by the African Union Commissioner for Peace and Security, regarding Somalia in particular (see S/PV.6409).

We would also like to underscore the importance of strengthening various institutionalized and inter-agency frameworks of cooperation between the African Union and the United Nations for effective institution-building and recovery in post-conflict countries in Africa. The growing cooperation between the Security Council and the Peace and Security Council of the African Union, as well as frameworks such as the recently launched African Union-United Nations Joint Task Force on Peace and Security, will, we believe, play a crucial role in guiding institution-rebuilding in African countries emerging from conflict.

Furthermore, the African Union looks forward to the implementation of the outcome of the review of the Peacebuilding Commission. We are also very pleased with the ongoing cooperation between the African Union and the United Nations regarding the strengthening of international civilian capacities. We also look forward to the review of the Ten-Year Capacity-Building Programme for the African Union that is being implemented by the Peacebuilding Commission. We are convinced that all of these frameworks will contribute to strengthening the entire process of institution-building in the aftermath of conflict.

With these brief remarks, we again welcome the Council's consideration of today's theme, and we take this opportunity to reiterate the African Union's appreciation to the Security Council and United Nations for their unwavering support for post-conflict reconstruction and development in Africa as a whole, among all the other areas to be focused on. The African Union remains ever grateful and looks forward to the continuing support of the Council on this issue, including on a number of initiatives launched within the context of the recently concluded Year of Peace and Security in Africa.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Benin.

Mr. Zinsou (Benin) (*spoke in French*): I would first like to warmly congratulate you, Mr. President, on your country's presidency of the Security Council and on the professionalism with which you are conducting its work for the month of January. I also congratulate your predecessor, the representative of the United States. I welcome the significant contribution of the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste to our debate this morning. I would also like to thank you, and through you the other members of the Security Council, as well as the Secretary-General, for their valuable contributions to this open debate on institution-building in the framework of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Institution-building is a crucial factor in stabilizing and strengthening sustainable peace in countries emerging from conflict. Its modalities must be studied in order to identify the conditions necessary for it to succeed fully in the countries affected. In this regard, I would like to share some modest reflections with the Council.

One of the most difficult and key challenges is to ensure that countries emerging from a devastating conflict do not relapse into violence. Here, I welcome the importance that the Council attaches to the efforts of the international community to promote peace processes. The first cardinal principle is to respect the need for national ownership based on the specifics and realities of each country concerned. The sole aim of external support should be to strengthen national capacities in order to establish and restore State institutions, centrally and locally. It must also mobilize civil society in order to credibly legitimize the exercise of power and the modalities for managing public affairs. The aim is to ensure as early as possible that peacebuilding plans launch a participatory and inclusive process that can restore basic services and restart economic activity in order to bolster confidence in and commitment to the peace process.

In designing different plans, we must seek to identify national capacities and establish a partnership with them so as to enable the established legal

authorities to be self-sustaining, to develop their own expertise and ultimately to be capable on their own of providing essential services and of earning legitimacy in the eyes of their people. In order to help achieve such a partnership between local actors and external contributors, the United Nations must focus on knowledge transfer and require it as an essential criterion when recruiting external actors. The permanency of the institutions established depends on this requirement, and the Security Council should supply the directives necessary in that respect.

In this context, Benin has solved the problem of transfer of expertise by designating, for each foreign expert recruited to supervise a project, a national counterpart assigned to work in tandem with him or her in order to ensure that projects under way can be effectively carried out. Such experts are as likely to come from countries of the South as of the North, but they will come increasingly, we hope, from the South. We hope that the forthcoming report on civil capacity will address these issues.

Successful institution-building, in our opinion, involves strengthening analytical capacities and designing national strategies for a country's recovery and development, while establishing an optimal balance between the structural and functional approaches. That will allow us to determine whether new institutions must be established or if coordination and cooperation mechanisms can be set up to carry out specific functions to meet particular needs. Identifying and meeting needs effectively requires the establishment of a hierarchy of true priorities on the ground in order to create the conditions necessary to the success of activities under way, even in the face of the fact that, in a post-conflict country, every need can seem to be a priority.

Nonetheless, laying the groundwork in close cooperation with national actors can help to identify the absolute top priorities. Such work can help decide which measures to take immediately and which to implement in the short- and medium terms, with the criterion for setting deadlines being their importance to maintaining functions crucial to people's lives and the stabilization of the country. Such work must also seek to identify the most vulnerable populations to target for emergency programmes and the restoration of basic services.

In any case, it is always necessary to better integrate all efforts involved, including those relating to the return of refugees and internally displaced persons; to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes; and to institution-building and the restoration of economic activity. This can be promoted through the granting of local procurement contracts through peacekeeping operations in order to rebuild local production capacity. That helps to generate resources locally in a way that can promote ownership of the recovery process. Thanks to its purview and broad membership, the Peacebuilding Commission is particularly sensitive to the causal links that can lead to a better analysis of data collected on the ground, which in turn can bring synergy to efforts to help synchronize peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts.

In that context, the Council can make use of the lessons learned by the Peacebuilding Commission in its work in various theatres of operation in the countries on its agenda. The mandates of peacekeeping operations must incorporate peacebuilding perspectives that take institution-building and the need for synchronization into account at an early stage. That will help to shorten the duration of peacekeeping operations and to transition as soon as possible into less complex peacebuilding missions designed to last longer because of the nature of their tasks and related long-term objectives.

The idea of devoting a part of the peacekeeping budget to financing priority peacebuilding activities in the countries affected must be expanded in order to alleviate pressure on the resources of the Peacebuilding Fund so that the Fund can truly serve the aims of conflict prevention in the broad sense of the term, including not only preventive institutional or operational support activities, but also post-conflict activities.

Current international affairs have many lessons to teach us on the need to demonstrate greater flexibility in applying criteria for the use of the Fund. It must remain a rapid-reaction instrument for promoting multilateral preventive diplomacy in all its forms and for supporting Member States in difficulty, whether or not they are classified as fragile States.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Botswana.

Mr. Ntwaagae (Botswana): Botswana attaches great importance to the promotion of institution-building, which is one of the main ingredients of the concept of post-conflict peacebuilding. In this connection, Sir, I wish to express my delegation's appreciation for your initiative to hold this open debate on the subject.

We welcome the participation earlier in the day of the Secretary-General, Mr. Ban-Ki moon, in these deliberations, as well as the presence of the Deputy Prime Minister of Timor-Leste. Their personal involvement in this debate demonstrates the high importance of the subject matter. I extend the same appreciation to the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Permanent Representative of Germany, for his continue high level of interest and effective stewardship of the Commission.

Botswana believes that peace, security and stability are prerequisites for attaining higher levels of development and quality of life. The promotion of positive values and practices such as tolerance, consultation, democracy, effective governance and the rule of law are of vital importance to the rebuilding of institutions that can drive major reconstruction in countries emerging from conflict. Botswana therefore wishes to emphasize the importance of supporting institutional development as a crucial step towards the prevention of conflict and laying the foundation for sustainable socio-economic development, peace and security. Botswana also believes that investing in reconstruction and rehabilitation of physical infrastructure, as well as in social and economic programmes, is a vital part of post-conflict reconstruction.

My delegation would like to underscore the importance of ensuring that assistance given to countries emerging from conflict is always accompanied by the establishment of legitimate State machinery in order to safeguard the interests and welfare of citizens. This is the surest way of consolidating the gains of peace, which could also go a long way towards enabling the effective delivery of basic services for human development, trade, investment and security. The rebuilding of credible judicial and law enforcement systems is also of vital importance so that the country is properly anchored in the rule of law, which is a necessary ingredient in the promotion of durable peace and the prevention of relapse into conflict.

Botswana also believes that post-conflict peacebuilding can succeed if we put a high premium on national ownership not only of the actual reconstruction activities, but also in determining the development priorities for which international assistance is being provided, as well as control of resource allocation.

Botswana maintains that it is important for the international community to strike when the iron is still hot in promoting post-conflict institution-building. Short-term humanitarian relief should therefore be accompanied by efforts to build facilities for schools, water reticulation, primary health care and related services, as well as the revitalization of key economic sectors.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reiterate Botswana's commitment to continuing to provide assistance and develop partnerships, within the limits of its capability, for the consolidation of peace and security, particularly on the African continent. Regional economic and social integration in Africa cannot succeed as long as pockets of instability and lawlessness disrupt the establishment of stable and effective administrations.

We support the promotion of cooperation at the bilateral, regional and international levels and among the various United Nations entities, as well as the role played by international financial institutions. We also urge the United Nations, through the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission, to continue to promote post-conflict institution building as a thematic and programme area.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Mr. Argüello (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I know that I am the last speaker this afternoon, so I will be brief. In any event, I should like to begin by saying that Argentina always welcomes the opportunity to participate in the open debates of the Security Council.

The United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, have a key responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security. They have a central role to play in post-conflict situations, building lasting peace, and establishing a sound foundation for sustainable development.

One major challenge faced today by the international community, and the United Nations in particular, is supporting countries recovering from conflict and seeking to build peace. As the Secretary-General underscores in his report, an effective response by the Organization requires a comprehensive and coordinated strategy that is based on the identification of priorities by local authorities and establishes clear objectives and timelines. That task requires the development of assistance activities in the humanitarian field, politics, security, the restoration of the rule of law, the promotion of development, and the protection and promotion of human rights. The task ahead is therefore enormous.

In considering the matter at hand, I should like to focus on three central aspects.

First, we believe that peacebuilding is primarily a national task and responsibility. Clearly, faced with diminished or destroyed local capacities in the wake of a conflict, we need to rely on the support of the international community. International, regional, subregional and non-governmental organizations have a central role to play in developing institutions, but always based on guidance and priorities established by local authorities. We underscore the importance of the participation and responsibility of authorities in the country emerging from conflict in the design phase of a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy and in identifying priorities and resources to be used in that strategy. These authorities will be involved throughout the entire rebuilding process, ensuring a consensual response in addressing the true causes of conflict more effectively and legitimately. In that regard, I would like to underscore the point made by the Deputy Prime Minister Guterres to the effect that a nation cannot be built on the basis of another nation, since there is no common model that can be applied to all.

Secondly, I wish to note the statement in the concept paper prepared by the delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina for this debate that "it is... too late to start developing institutional capacities when peacebuilding efforts are already at the exit strategy phase" (*S/2011/16, annex, p. 2*). On the contrary, it is immediately following a conflict that there are the greatest challenges to and the greatest opportunities for starting institution-building.

As I have said on many occasions in this Council on behalf of my delegation, in particular in reference to the situation of Haiti, we must promote peacebuilding so that the presence of the United Nations and the international community will not be necessary. The fact that local authorities have the institutional capacity to shoulder their responsibilities will be the gauge of the success of the Organization's work.

Finally, I wish to stress the important role played by regional and subregional organizations in conflict prevention, management and resolution, in line with the provisions of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter and the need to strengthen the capacities of regional systems to support countries in post-conflict recovery and reconstruction.

In addition, I underscore the key role of the Organization in post-conflict peacebuilding and its privileged position in coordinating the international community's various initiatives, ensuring that all efforts contribute to the goal of institution-building and are in line with national priorities.

The President: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.